A Study of *She Stoops to Conquer*

by Atsuko Yamura

I

When Oliver Goldsmith's first comedy, *The Good-Natur'd Man* was performed in 1768, the English stage was so overcharged with sentimentalism that it did not start burning cheerfully with the fire of the Comic Muse. The play was fairly well received except the bailiff scene which, now regarded as the pick of his humour, was removed from the stage as "intolerable"[1] to the genteel eye of the day. "The Comic Muse," however, was already "a-dying"[2] five years later, unless healed by Goldsmith's second comedy, *She Stoops to Conquer* produced in 1773.

The story of the production of this play is very interesting. Colman, who had put *The Good-Natur'd Man* on stage at Covent Garden, was slow in answering the request to put the second play on stage, finally returning the manuscript to the author. Goldsmith then sent it to David Garrick of Drury Lane, who adapted it, encouraged by Samuel Foote's puppet show, *The Handsome Housemaid or Piety in Pattens*, which had successfully ridiculed the sentimental comedies of the time. On entering the stage-door with a great fear of the audience's reaction, Goldsmith unluckily heard the only hiss of that night probably from one of his rivals. Contrary to his fear, however, the play was a great success and also bore him a considerable financial relief.[3]

It seems proper to suppose that the people of the time had been consciously or unconsciously getting tired of dull sentimental comedies and were ready to accept something new without knowing what that something should be. And the audience, who had still preferred Kelly's *False Delicacy*[4] to *The Good Natur'd Man* five years before, laughed heartily over every line in *She Stoops to Conqer*. Neither should we forget what the actors might have done to the

theatrical success of the comedy, although they are said to have been not very enthusiastic about this play.[5] Any drama, of course, needs good acting. But, particularly a "laughing" comedy will become nothing but the salt without its savor, if dull actors drag it around on the stage being unable to make people laugh. Fortunately, the eighteenth century was a century of good actors rather than of good playwrights, and Garrick was himself a most prominent actor of the day and had the experience of both producing and acting various plays, new ones and old ones, comedies as well as tragedies, including some twenty of Shakespearean dramas.[6]

There is yet another point to be noticed without fail. It is true that Goldsmith "was strongly prepossessed in favour of" such Restoration playwrights as Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar, "and strove to imitate them,"[7] but, what he gained from them did not include the indecency of their period. Otherwise, the audience would still have rejected his plays, however bright with humour his dialogue might have been, and however vivid his description of characters might have been. And what he had left behind to the Restoration period was richly replaced by his own amiable traits, which are to be discussed hereafter in this article.

II

A brief discussion here of a few typical Restoration and sentimental comedies may serve to show Goldsmith's merits better.

Richard Steele's *The Conscious Lovers* (1720) is a very good specimen and one of the finest of the sentimental type. The hero of the play, Bevil Jr., is described as an ideal young man with a strong sense of honor, obedience to his father, and faithfulness to his beloved, Indiana. He supports Indiana "in the condition of a woman of quality" without "any ill design,"[8] as she is an orphan living with her aunt Isabella.

His obedience to his father, however, seems almost ridiculous and exaggerated, when he makes no effort to make his father under-

stand that he cannot marry Lucinda, Mr. Sealand's daughter whom Sir John Bevil recommends or rather demands him to marry. Fortunately Indiana happens to be identified as Mr. Sealand's long-lost daughter and Isabella as his sister. Sir John Bevil now agrees to the marriage of his son with Indiana. Meanwhile, Cimberton, who, with Mrs. Sealand's backing, has been courting Lucinda, withdraws his proposal of marriage on the ground that a half of Lucinda's fortune is now gone to her restored sister, thus enabling her to marry her lover, Myrtle.

In this comedy is found some satire on " servants undergoing the corruption of lackeydom," " marriage of convenience," " duelling," " the chicanery of the law," [9] and so forth. But the satire is very mild, as an example may be found in the humorous passage where Bevil Jr. tells his father how he appreciates his arrangement of the marriage with Lucinda.[10] Some of the characters have follies, but they do not cause too much trouble. Cimberton is a coxcomb and perhaps looks more hateful to our eyes than others as he wishes to marry Lucinda for the pecuniary advantage. But he is very easily defeated when fortune forsakes him.

As for the dialogue, main characters seldom make funny or even humorous remarks. Cimberton and Mrs. Sealand play comic parts, but most of the "sparkling dialogue" is left to minor characters like servants.[11] The play on the whole is didactic. Yet, *The Conscious Lovers* is greatly improved in integrating moral elements into the play instead of merely forcing them on. And the sentimental speeches of Bevil Jr., such as, "If you think that an obligation, sir, give me leave to overpay myself, in the only instance that can now add to my felicity, by begging you to bestow this lady on Mr. Myrtle," [12] are far more natural than those found in some other sentimental comedies, such as, "Oh, Seal my pardon with thy trembling lips, while with this tender grasp of fond reviving love I seize my bliss, and stifle all thy wrongs forever."[13]

Sentimental comedy has done all these in its revolt against the

indecency of Restoration comedy, which had been severely attacked by Jeremy Collier in his "Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage" in 1698. Restoration comedies are the very reverse of sentimental comedies in many points. Instead of praising people's virtues and setting them to be our examples, they make fun of people with their follies along with their lovable points, and often heroize those who should be rather disgusted from the moral point of view. For example, William Wycherley, in *The Country Wife* (1675), ridicules Mr. Pinchwife and Sparkish. The former has an excess of suspicion in his wife, which becomes the very cause of her misdoing, and the latter, with too much confidence in his *fiancé*, loses her to a rival. The hero who plays the part of ridiculing this suspicious husband is Honer, who has facilitated himself to seduce many women by the false report of being eunuch. Villain as he is, Mrs. Pinchwife describes him as "a proper, goodly, strong man,"[14] and he does not receive any punishment.

The greatest merit of Restoration comedy is often said to lie in the highly comic characters and their brilliant dialogue which plays a greater part than the plot. Although these highly comic characters may look distorted, they are described far more realistically than the characters of sentimental comedies. They are observed through a magnifying glass, so to speak, which shows every little dust on human nature. This insight into human nature and the ability to tell the truth in an amusing way is the real merit of the comedy of this type.

From this viewpoint, *The Way of the World* (1700) by William Congreve is an excellent example. This play was written after the attack of Jeremy Collier, and is said to be free from the indecency found in other Restoration plays. And yet, it deals with the upper-class world of "fashionable people, gaming, gossiping, pursuing their amours."[15] Fainall might not be so shocking a villain as Honer, but he is in love with another woman beside his wife, and tries to get hold of all of Mrs. Wishfort's money in right of his wife who

is her daughter. The realistic touch of Congreve is shown in his treatment of Mirabell and Millamant. They are the central figures of the play, but they are not in any way heroized. Mirabell is a man who not only had an affair with Millamant's cousin but also married her off to Fainall as a cover-up. Nor does Congreve make him a "converted" man in his new love for Millamant.[16] They are not a hero and a heroine who fight through adversities with high ideals and win the final victory. They are rather ordinary man and woman who know "the way of the world" and manage to achieve their aim.

The Way of the World was not successful on the stage especially because of the complexity of its plot. Very careful reading reveals the author's mature attitude in developing his characters. The brilliancy of the dialogue is often said to have never been surpassed. Yet, no drama can go very much higher than the standard of its audience. Particularly, the comedy that aims to make the audience laugh can not expect them to exercise their intelligence to the full extent.

III

One element that made *She Stoops to Conquer* successful is the simplicity and naturalness not only of the plot but also of the humour and the characters. In this comedy, Goldsmith introduces us an old mansion in the country, where the Hardcastles live and where the amusing events take place, including the principal comic situation founded on the author's own boyhood experience of mistaking an old house for an inn.

From the opening scene, a clear-cut contrast between the husband and his wife amuses us. Hardcastle is a man who loves "anything that's old" (Act I, Scene ii) and directs his partial love towards his daughter Kate. On the other hand, Mrs. Hardcastle tries hard to follow the fashion in London. Her maternal love is limited to Tony Lumpkin, son between her and her former husband.

She plans to marry him to her niece, Constance Neville, who is now in care of the Hardcastles and entrusts them with a considerable fortune mostly consisting of jewels. Mr. Hardcastle has arranged the matter so that Young Marlow, son to Hardcastle's friend, should come down to meet Miss Hardcastle for courtship.

The play gets on the move as Marlow and his friend Hastings get lost on their way to Hardcastle's house and come upon the ale-house where Tony is drinking and carousing with his friends as usual. Tony shows them the way to his house, saying they will find "one of the best inns in the whole county." (Act I, Scene ii) They arrive at the house, mistaking it for an inn and Mr. and Mrs. Hardcastle for the inn-keeper and the land-lady. Here we are shown that Marlow who is said to be the most bashful English young man especially "in the company of women of reputation" (Act II) can behave most freely and arrogantly in such places as inns or in front of such women as barmaids. The scene of his meeting with Miss Hardcastle is one of the most humorous. He makes a great effort to carry on the grave conversation, "being unable even to look up during the interview." (Act II)

Mr. Hardcastle's impression of Marlow as "the most impudent piece of brass that ever spoke with a tongue," (Act III) and Kate's impression of Marlow as the most timid and modest young man present another pleasing contrast. In order to know Marlow's real character, Kate dresses herself up like a barmaid and approaches him, and the young man passionately falls in love with her. Mr. Hardcastle, watching them unseen, gets angry at the way Marlow behaves toward his daughter and tries to drive him out of the house. The timely arrival of Sir Charles Marlow clears up the misunderstanding on both sides and all ends happily, uniting Marlow and Kate in marriage.

The subsidiary plot of the love affair between Hastings and Miss Neville, which also ends happily, enlivens the play all the more, and, especially, brings Tony Lumpkin's comic character in clear

relief, as he uses all his wits in helping the two lovers.

Above is, of course, a very rough outline of the play, and there are minor events and conflicts. But they are well constructed and never divert from the main plot, so that the play is easy to understand.

As for the dialogue, it is not inferior to that of Congreve in its brilliancy. Almost every phrase is humorous, and at the same time shows the character of the person who speaks it. Moreover, it always contributes to the developement of the drama itself, and never is put in merely for the sake of an amusing conversation. For example, the scene full of funny remarks exchanged between Hardcastle and his servants, as he teaches them how to behave when the guests come, might for a moment seem to be merely a funny episode. But very soon, when Hastings and Marlow enter, we find that it was a good preparation for a major and even more humorous scene between the guests and the host that follows. Besides, that the servants are not used to this kind of formal reception and that they are stiff and frightened helps to keep the guests believing the house to be an inn.[17]

IV

Every character in this comedy plays an important role. In terms of the plot and of the frequency of their appearance on the stage, Sir Charles Marlow, the servants, and the landlord and Tony's friends in the ale-house are minor characters, and Hastings and Constance Neville have more to do with the secondary plot. In the main plot, Young Marlow and each one of the Hardcastles have just about the same importance. Yet, were any one of these characters omitted, the construction of the play would become fragile and the comic spirit greatly lessened.

The most important figure is Tony Lumpkin. Tony is not the hero of the play in the sense that Honeywood is in *The Good-Natur'd Man*. In his first comedy, Goldsmith makes Honeywood's "good-

naturedness" and the troubles caused by it the theme of the play. From this point, Young Marlow and Kate must be regarded as the hero and heroine in *She Stoops to Conquer*, for the main plot begins in Mr. Hardcastle's arrangement of their marriage and ends in their happy union. Tony is to them what Fainall is to Mirabell and Millamant in *The Way of the World*, or what Horner is to Mr. and Mrs. Pinchwife in *The Country Wife*. In his function in the play, Tony resembles also to John Falstaff in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In this Shakespearean comedy, Falstaff is always the cause or the main source of the funny events. Yet, the play shows more of the life of the citizens in Windsor rather than that of Falstaff. Likewise, *She Stoops to Conquer* is not a story of Tony Lumpkin in particular, and yet, he is the one who gives the play its core and symbolizes the comic atmosphere.

There is also something in common between the two characters —something for which we cannot but love them in spite of their mischieves. But let us confine our study here to Tony Lumpkin and see the few points for which we find him lovable. Tony cannot, by any means, be regarded as an ideal young man or a dutiful son like Sir Bevil Jr. in *The Conscious Lovers*. "The ale-house and the stable are the only schools he'll ever go to," (Act I, Scene i) as his step-father says, and he spends his days idly away, "burning the footmen's shoes, frighting the maids, and worrying the kittens," and he even fastens his father's wig to the back of his chair to see him make a bow with his bold head popped in Mrs. Frizzle's face. (Act I, Scene i) With a cold attitude Tony responds to his mother's doting love. He never listens to her pleadings or threats. In helping the elopement of Hastings and Constance, he mocks his mother by taking away the jewel casket and pretending not to know, and he frightens her to death by driving her in a carriage round and round the horse-pond for hours and telling her they are forty-miles off lost upon "Crackskull Common." (Act V, Scene ii)

Yet we should note that the way he treats her is always

delighfully comic to the audience. Several reasons may be counted for it. First of all, note his witty remarks. Who can help laughing heartily to hear him say, when Mrs. Hardcastle pleads him to "disappoint for one night" his friends at the ale-house by staying home with her, "As for disappointing *them*, I should not so much mind; but I can't abide to disappoint *myself*." (Act I, Scene i)

Secondly, one of his functions in the play is to mock Mrs. Hardcastle, that is, we feel pleasure in attacking her vanity or her excessive love toward her son. Another important point is that Tony does not do all these out of hatred or greed. It is often seen in everyday life that a boy who is spoilt by his mother and takes her love for granted treats her in a similar way. Even his "revenge" to his father-in-law who called him "whelp and hound" (Act I, Scene ii) goes no further than raillery in misinforming the guests about the house.

Tony has no avarice like Fainall or Cimberton. The fortune of fifteen hundred a year promissed to be his when he comes of age[18] is enough for him. He hates to marry Constance in spite of her fortune. He helps Hastings to elope with her and takes her jewel casket out ot his mother's bureau for them in a most nonchalant way, without even expecting them to give him any of the jewel or to do anything for him in return except that Constance should be taken away from him. Although the plot fails, he is quite content to know that he has come of age, acquiring a right to refuse his cousin and be "his own man again." (Act V, Scene iii)

The character of Mrs. Hardcastle is also vivid and comic. Every word she speaks reveals some phase of her character. Although her speech is usually covered by feigned gentleness, she is as cunning as his son. She refuses Constance's request to have her jewels and says that Constance is too young and beautiful to wear jewels which are to repair beauty "twenty years later." (Act III) To keep Tony's real age secret from him was also her cunning design. She

cannot always keep gentleness, but "she fidgets and spits about like a Catherine wheel" (Act III) when she finds the jewel casket stolen. She cries out with dirty words even to her dear son when she finds him too hard to manage.[19] Her vanity for fashion is also well ridiculed by Hastings who says that he concluded "from her air and manner" that she had been bred "either at Ranelagh, St. James's, or Tower Wharf." (Act II)

Mrs. Hardcastle is shallow-brained, but on the other hand, her simplicity is rather pleasing and calls for our sympathy. Even her greed or cunningness is not very formidable. When she is ridiculed, or when she is mortified, we laugh at her, but, at the bottom of our heart, we feel some sympathy toward her.

Mr. Hardcastle, unlike his wife, hates vanity and affectation. He wishes that London could "keep its own fools at home," and "the follies of the town" would not come into the country so fast. (Act I, Scene i) He prefers to see his daughter in plain dress instead of in a great "quantity of superfluous silk." (Act I, Scene i) Although he is peculiarly fond of old things, he is a fine master of the family, being lenient to his servants and fond of his *old* wife. With much understanding he is an ideal father to Kate. He makes an agreement with her that she may dress in her own manner in the morning to receive guests and to dress in plain manner in the evening to suit her father's will. Even when he is infuriated by Marlow's impudence, he allows Kate some time to prove his modesty. Although he does not love Tony so much as Kate and usually speaks ill against him, his treatment of Tony is not quite unfair. He concurred with his wife to conceal Tony's age as it seemed "likely to conduce to his improvement." (Act V, Scene iii) However, when he finds his wife "turn it to a wrong use," he declares the truth and enables Tony to refuse Constance's hand with all her fortune lawfully at her own disposal. (Act V, Scene iii)

Miss Hardcastle is a lovely creation of the poet. Like her mother, she loves fineries, but she also resembles her father in her

prudence and always tries to obey him. She is a good specimen of a young girl wishing to have a young handsome lover.[20] She is clever, and what she does is always constructive. Whenever Marlow staggers during their conversation, she puts some clever words to help him proceed.

She plays very well the character of a barmaid, in which she "stoop's to conquer" (Act IV) that Marlow may see her more fully and that she may observe him when he is "off his guard." (Act III) At first, Kate is a little hesitant to accept Marlow, as she thinks he is even more reserved than she heard. But, by acquainting with him personally, she finds that he is reserved only from his fear of too respectable ladies, and that he can be a fine bold lover to one with whom he can feel at home.

Even Sir Charles Marlow recommended his son to Mr. Hardcastle as the most modest man.[21] His friend Hastings was perhaps the only one who knew his real character.[22] Hastings knows that Marlow is witty, and wishes Marlow could "say half the fine things to modest women that he hears him "lavish upon the barmaid of an inn, or even a college bed maker." (Act II)

Marlow is described by Hastings as a warm friend. His love toward Kate, as supposed to be a barmaid, is at first jesting, but gradually grows warm and sincere. When he is told that the house is Hardcastle's, he still takes Kate to be one of the servants and decides to leave her without "bringing ruin upon one whose only fault was being too lovely." (Act IV) His love is sincere, but he thinks the difference of their "birth, fortune, and education" makes an honorable connection impossible. (Act IV) This prudence makes Miss Hardcastle respect him more than ever, and makes her feel that she "never knew half his merit." (Act IV) The words he tells Kate at his parting is the key to the understanding of his character. He says, "Were I to live for myself alone, I could easily fix my choice. But I owe too much to the opinion of the world, too much to the authority of a father." (Act IV) This sense of obligation

makes him act awkwardly and makes him lose his confidence. And at the same time, anywhere he needs not be conscious of his obligation becomes an outlet for his true temperament in an exaggerated form.

V

Mr. Tsuneari Fukuda warns us against the mistake of laying too much stress on the analytic study of the characters' psychology in Shakespearean plays. Unlike modern novelists, he says, Shakespeare did not consciously try to build consistent portraits of characters in his plays, but, as the result of his attempt to build up purely dramatic situations of either an outward or an inward world, his characters became even more life-like and profound.[23]

This attitude seems to be applicable to the study of *She Stoops to Conquer*, for it should be remembered that Goldsmith's chief intention was to laugh at people's follies in line with the concept of the comedy defined by Aristotle instead of showing us well-rounded portraits of people. Goldsmith asserts that "all the great masters in the dramatic art" has a rule that "as tragedy displays the calamities of the great, so comedy should excite our laughter by ridiculously exhibiting the follies of the lower parts of mankind." He also says, "Distress is the proper object of tragedy, since the great excite our pity by their fall; but not equally so of comedy, since the actors employed in it are originally so mean, that they sink but little by their fall."[24]

As has already been described, the play is full of broadly humorous situations mainly based upon the ever-popular case of mistaken-identity. Even Horace Walpole, the bitterest critic of the play, admits that the situations are "well imagined and make one laugh." Walpole's charge against the play[25] as "the lowest of all farces," with gross dialogues and forced witticisms, can be easily refuted, because it is merely a typical charge from sentimental standpoint. The above study might be enough to show the fallacy of his charge that the characterization is inadequate. The impro-

bability of motif and incidents, of which he also accuses the author, may be sufficiently disposed of, because some of the incidents were taken from what actually happened.[26] The mistaking the old house for an inn is taken from the author's own boyhood experience, as has already been pointed out. Tying a wig to the back of a chair is a trick the author himself was played on.[27] A similar trick to that of Tony upon his mother was played upon Madame de Genlis by Sheridan.[28]

Of course, it remains true that all these events are unusual and even incredible. But many great dramatists do use some unusual events in order to produce really dramatic situations. As in many other great dramas, naturalness or convincingness in entirety shows the excellence of *She Stoops to Conquer*. This comes from Goldsmith's "excellent preparation for the incidents, clever handling of the plot, and naturalness of characters."[29] An example may be seen in the case of Marlow's failure to discern Miss Hardcastle disguised as a barmaid. This indeed is unusual. But Goldsmith cleverly prepared to make this look natural. Marlow is so exceedingly shy that he doesn's see Miss Hardcastle's face well enough to remember it during their first interview. Miss Hardcastle has a big bonnet on, so that, even if he does look up, he cannot see her very well.[30] And the naturalness owes especially to the fact that the situations are such that are unseparable from the characters. Mr. Hardcastle who is peculiarly fond of old things is "just the man to have his house mistaken for an inn."[31] When Mrs. Hardcastle takes her husband for a highwayman at the horse-pond and begs for his son's life, Goldsmith could not bring his other character in this same situation; for we laugh not merely at the absurdity of the mistake, but also and even more at the poor mother who is mocked by her son and is still begging for his life at the risk of her own.

It is clear from the above study that *She Stoops to Conquer* has very little traits of sentimentalism. The characters have follies. None of them are described as an ideal man or set up as our

example. On the other hand, neither did Goldsmith put in very villainous character, nor is his world the frivolous court life found in the Restoration plays All the events are taken from the circle of a comparatively peaceful family. And also there is some element of poetic justice, as Mrs. Hardcastle's plan to marry her son to her rich niece ends in failure and all true lovers are united in the end just like the case of *The Conscious Lovers*. This does not mean that all the Restoration playwrights were mere wantons. It might have been rather the indignation that made Wycherley expose so mercilessly those "vice, social chicanary and hypocrisy of his age." [32] Of course, it cannot be said that the eighteenth century society had no vice to be attacked upon. It seems only that Goldsmith avoided to deal with dark problems or to dig too deeply into the follies of people. He never takes his joke "out of a misery, or an ugliness, or a mortification, or anything that, apart from the joke, would be likely to give pain." [33] Though Goldsmith says that his purpose is to laugh at people, he does not put in such follies or vices that might make the audience avert their eyes from the stage. It must owe partly to the tendency of the audience of the time who had already been baptized with sentimentalizm. But it owes mostly to Goldsmith's own character. In his other writings also, especially in such a poem as *The Deserted Village* (1770), we can find his constant inclination to escape from the darkness of the reality into the world of beauty. And this, therefore, is the limitations of his art, and at the same time the merit and the singularity of the poet.

At present, nobody perhaps insists upon following the definition of comedy by Goldsmith. Sometimes it is hard even to classify a play into tragedy or comedy. It is possible for a dramatist to treat a very serious matter,—calamities and distress of people, whether great or poor—and give a happy ending under the name of comedy. There are also tragi-comedies, which have both tragic and comic plots in one play, or tragic and comic elements in one plot.[34]

Thus, Goldsmith's theory may seem to be a little antiquated or

too formulistic. Yet, it is still true that the exhibition of human absurdity excites our laughter more than anything else, and Goldsmith was successful in raising a most genuine laughter. Therefore, no matter what kind of comedy becomes predominant in the theatre, *She Stoops to Conquer* will claim its own singular merit and continue to flow through generations with delightful soothing sound. And, as William Black, his most sympathetic critic, says, if "he avoids the darker problems of existence," "we can pardon the omission for the sake of the gentle optimism that would rather look on the kindly side of life." [35]

NOTES

[1] Quoted from *the Monthly Review* in William Black, *The Life of Oliver Goldsmith* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1909), p. 108.

[2] George Pierce Baker (ed.), *Oliver Goldsmith* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1931), p. 112. This is the text of this study. The quotation is from Garrick's Prologue to *She Stoops to Conquer.*

Quotations from *She Stoops to Conquer* will be shown hereinafter by the act and the scene in parentheses.

[3] See: William Black, pp. 142-148.
John Forster, *The Life and Times of Oliver Goldsmsth* (London: Bickers & Son, 1877), pp. 411-420.

[4] When Colman accepted the production of *The Good-Natur'd Man* at Covent Garden, David Garrick, who had rejected it, rushed the production of Kelly's *False Delicacy*, a sentimental comedy, which, with various advantages, apparently won the victory over its new rival. See: Jay B. Hubbell & John O. Beaty, "The Drama of the Eighteenth Century," *An Introduction to Drama* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1929), p. 381. See also: Forster, p. 294.

[5] "Introduction" by Austin Dobson in Baker, p. 21.
Forster, pp. 413-414.

[6] Hubbell & Beaty, p. 378.

[7] "Preface" to *The Good-Natur'd Man* in Baker, p. 29.

[8] Richard Steele, *The Conscious Lovers* (Act I, Scene ii) in F. Tupper & J. W. Tupper, *Representative English Dramas from Dryden to Sheridan* (Oxford University Press, 1914), p. 240.

[9] Tupper, quoting Routh, pp. 229-230.

[10] See: "...and you have, sir, found the inconvenience there is when a man weds with too much love in his head... experience has made you wiser in your care of me; for, sir, since you lost my dear mother, your time has been so heavy, so lonely, and so tasteless, that you are so good as to guard me against the like unhappiness, by marrying me prudentially by way of bargain and sale." (Act I, Scene ii)

[11] Tupper, pp. 230-231.

[12] Richard Steele, *The Conscious Lovers* (Act V, Scene iii).

[13] Hubbell and Beaty quoting Loveless' words from *Love's Last Shift* by Colley Cibber, p. 371.

[14] William Wycherley, *The Country Wife* (Act IV, Scene ii) in *Twelve Famous Plays of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century* (New York: The Modern Library, 1933), p. 52.

[15] Cleanth Brooks & Robert B. Heilman, "The Way of the World," *Understanding Drama* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1948), p. 398.

[16] Ibid., p. 443.

[17] See: Marlow. How's this! Sure, I have not mistaken the house? Everthing looks like an inn. The servants cry "Coming." The attendance is awkward...(Act IV)

[18] See: Mrs. Hardcastle. No matter, Tony Lumpkin has a good fortune. My son is not to live by his learning. I don't think a boy wants much learning to spend fifteen hundred a year. (Act I, Scene i)

See also: Tony. ... afraid of what? I shall soon be worth fifteen hundred a year, and let him frighten me out of that if he can! (Act I, Scene ii).

[19] See: Mrs. Hardcastle. No, Tony, you then go to the ale house or kennel. I'm never to be delighted with your agreeable wild notes, unfeeling monster. (Act II)

Here again, she is argued down by Tony who says, "Ecod, Mamma, your own notes are the wildest of the two!"

[20] See: Miss Hardcastle. ...*Young, handsome;* these he put last; but I put them foremost. *Sensible, good-natured;* I like all that. But then *reserved,* and *sheepish,* that's much against him. (Act I, Scene i)

[21] See: Hardcastle. What could my old friend Sir Charles mean by recommending his son as the modestest young man in town? (Act III)

[22] See Act II.

[23] Tsuneari Fukuda, "Production of Shakespearean Plays," *Invitation to the Theatre*, (Tokyo: Shincho-sha, 1957), pp. 169-178.

[24] See: Goldsmith, *An Essay on the Theatre; or, a Comparison between Laughing and Sentimental Comedy*.

[25] Quoted in Tupper, p. 321.

[26] Austin Dobson, "Introduction" in Baker, p. 23.

[27] Forster, p. 411.

[28] Tupper, p. 322.

[29] Loc. cit.

[30] See: Miss Hardcastle. ...for though we spoke for some time together, yet his fears were such that he never once looked up during the interview. Indeed, if he had, my bonnet would have kept him from seeing me.

[31] Forster, p. 441.

[32] F. E. Schelling, "The Restoration Drama, I," *Cambridge History of English* Literature Vol. VIII (London: Cambridge University Press, 1932), pp. 144-145.

[33] Forster, p. 441.

[34] Naoya Uchimura, *A Study of Dramaturgy*, (Tokyo: Hakusui-sha, 1956), pp. 108-110.

[35] William Black, p. 1.